# SUPREME COURT FILED

# SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

JUN 0 8 2018

Jorge Navarrete Clerk

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

Petitioner and Appellant,

Deputy

VS.

REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Respondents.

After A Decision By The Court of Appeal First Appellate District, Division One No. A144500

> San Francisco Superior Court (The Honorable Marla J. Miller) No. CPF-14-513-434

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO'S CONDITIONAL NON-OPPOSITION TO CSU TRUSTEES' MOTION REQUESTING JUDICIAL NOTICE; DECLARATION OF PETER J. KEITH

DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney CHRISTINE VAN AKEN, State Bar #241755 Chief of Appellate Litigation PETER J. KEITH, State Bar #206482 Chief Attorney, Neighborhood & Residential Safety Division 1390 Market Street, Sixth Floor San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 554-3908 Facsimile: (415) 437-4644 E-Mail: peter.keith@sfcityatty.org Attorneys for Petitioner and Appellant CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

### STATEMENT OF CONDITIONAL NON-OPPOSITION

San Francisco does not oppose Respondent Trustees of the California State University (CSU)'s March 27, 2018 request for judicial notice of certain legislative history of San Francisco's parking tax, provided that the Court grants San Francisco's cross-motion for judicial notice of additional legislative history materials which San Francisco offers to correct an inaccurate statement in CSU's brief regarding the history of San Francisco's parking tax.

#### **BACKGROUND**

This appeal concerns whether a city can require state universities that operate paid parking lots within the city to collect and remit city parking taxes owed by their customers.

On March 27, 2018, CSU filed a motion for judicial notice of San Francisco's original parking tax ordinance enacted in 1970, and a subsequent November 27, 1970 San Francisco City Attorney letter advising that this 1970 ordinance by its terms did not require parking tax collection by state universities; CSU also seeks judicial notice of a 2010 amendment. CSU offers these materials to provide "helpful context to the present dispute between San Francisco and CSU." (RJN at 4.)

However, CSU's brief makes an incorrect statement that San Francisco's amendment of its ordinance to require tax collection by the state universities was "recent[]," specifically in 2010. (CSU 23-24.) But additional legislative history (which CSU's request for judicial notice does not include) shows that San Francisco amended its ordinance in 1971 to require the state universities to collect and remit parking tax. (Declaration of Peter J. Keith, Exhs. A & B.) San Francisco is moving separately for

judicial notice of those materials, concurrently with filing this conditional non-opposition.

Dated: June 8, 2018

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney
CHRISTINE VAN AKEN
Chief of Appellate Litigation
PETER J. KEITH
Chief Attorney, Neighborhood &
Residential Safety Division

By:

PETER J. KEITH

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Appellant CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

## DECLARATION OF PETER J. KEITH

I, Peter J. Keith, declare:

- 1. I am the Deputy City Attorney assigned to represent the City and County of San Francisco in this action. I have personal knowledge of the contents of this declaration, and, if called upon to testify, I could and would testify competently to the contents of this declaration.
- 2. My office requested from the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors for the City and County of San Francisco a certified copy of the complete legislative file for Ordinance No. 9-71, namely File No. 228-70-5, and received from the Clerk said copy certified on May 29, 2018.
- 3. Attached as Exhibit A to this declaration is a true and correct copy of Ordinance No. 9-71 as passed, from the certified copy of the complete legislative file supplied by the Clerk.
- 4. Attached as Exhibit B to this declaration is a true and correct copy of the December 17, 1970 letter from the proponent of Ordinance No.

9-71, Tax Collector Thad Brown, to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, without its enclosures, from the certified copy of the complete legislative file supplied by the Clerk.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on June 8, 2018.

PETER J. KEITH

# **INDEX TO EXHIBITS**

<b>Exhibit</b>	<u>Description</u>
Α	S.F. Ordinance No. 9-71 (1971)
В	Letter from Tax Collector Thad Brown to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (December 17, 1970) (without enclosures)

**EXHIBIT A** 

8 9

 AMENDING ARTICLE 9, PART III OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL GODE BY AMENDING SECTION 601 THEREOF, RELATING TO IMPOSITION OF A TAX ON THE PARKING OF MOTOR VEHICLES IN PARKING STATIONS, TO REVISE THE DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS "PERSON" AND "OPERATOR" AND BY AMENDING SECTION 616 THEREOF TO CLARIFY THE STATUS OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco: Section 1. Sections 601 and 616 of Article 9 of Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code are hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 601. <u>Definitions</u>. When used in this Article the following terms shall mean or include:

- (a) "Person." A natural person, receiver, administrator, executor, assignee, trustee in bankruptcy, trust, estate, firm, copartnership, joint venture, club, company, joint stock company, business trust, municipal corporation, the State of California, any political subdivision of the State of California, the United States, any instrumentality of the United States, domestic or foreign corporation, association, syndicate, society, or any group of individuals acting as a unit, whether mutual, cooperative, fraternal, nonprofit or otherwise. Whenever the term "person" is used in any clause prescribing and imposing a penalty, the term as applied to corporations and business entities shall mean the officers thereof.
- (b) "Operator." Any person operating a parking station in the City and County of San Francisco, including, but not limited to, the owner or proprietor of such premises, lesses, sub-lessee, mortgagee in possession, licensee or any other person otherwise operating such parking station. A person who otherwise qualifies as an operator as herein defined shall not, by reason of the fact that he was exempt from the tax herein imposed, be exempted from the obligations of an operator hereunder.

1

10

14 15

16

17 18 19

20 21 22

23 24

25 26

27

28 29

"Occupant." A person who, for a consideration, uses, possesses or has the right to use or possess any space for the parking of a motor vehicle in a parking station under any lease, concession, permit, right of access, license to use or other agreement or otherwise.

- "Occupancy." The use or possession or the right to the use or possession of any space for the parking of a motor vehicle in a parking station.
- (e) "Parking Station." The term "parking station" shall include but is not limited to: (1) any outdoor space or uncovered plot, place, lot, parcel, yard or enclosure, or any portion thereof, where motor vehicles may be parked, stored, housed or kept, for which any charge is made; (2) any building or structure, or any portion thereof in which motor vehicles may be parked, stored, housed or kept, for which any charge is made.
- "Motor Vehicle." The term "motor vehicle" includes every self-propelled vehicle operated or suitable for operation on the highway.
- "Rent." The consideration received for occupancy valued in money, whether received in money or otherwise, including all receipts, eash, credits, and property or services of any kind or nature, and also the amount for which credit is allowed by the operator to the occupant, without any deduction therefrom whatsoever.
- (h) "Return." Any return, filed or required to be filed as herein provided.
- (i) 'Tax Collector,' The Tax Collector of the City and County of San Francisco.
- (j) "Controller." The Controller of the City and County of San Francisco.

- (1) "Tax." The tax imposed by this Article.
- (m) "Parking Meter." Any device which, when the recording device thereof is set in motion, or immediately following the deposit of any coin, shall register the period of time that any motor vehicle may be parked adjacent thereto.

Sec. 616. Saving Clause. Nothing in this ordinance shall be construed as requiring the payment of any tax by the United States of America, or by the State of California, or by any municipal corporation, or by any of their subdivisions; nor shall this ordinance be construed as requiring the payment of any tax prohibited by the Constitution of the United States or by the Constitution of the State of California.

If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Article or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Article or any part thereof. The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

THOMAS M. O'CONNOR, City Attorney

By S/John J. Doherty
Deputy City Attorney

**EXHIBIT B** 

7 4 5-10-4

# CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCHERPED

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND RECORDS OF SUPERVISORS SAN FRANCISCO

OFFICE OF AX COLLECTOR CITY HALL N FRANCISCO, CALIF. 94102 TEL.: 558-6161

1970 DEC 18 AMII: 31

December 17, 1970

SUBJECT:

Parking Tax Ordinance

Through Thomas J. Mellon, Chief Administrative Officer

Honorable Board of Supervisors Room 235, City Hall San Francisco, California

Attention: Robert J. Dolan, Clerk of the Board

Gentlemen:

Please find attached a proposed amendment to the Parking Tax Ordinance which mandates that non-taxable entities such as governmental agencies collect parking charges from their employees or the general public if they are parking their automobiles in parking stations owned or operated by such entities and are paying a parking charge for such privilege of parking.

For your additional information please find attached copies of correspondence from the Vice Chancellor in charge of administration for the University of California, San Francisco, a letter from the Tax Collector to the City Attorney asking for an opinion and an opinion from the City Attorney outlining the reasons therefore and his suggested amendment for the correction of this deficiency.

Very truly yours,

Approved by:

Virgil L. Elliott,

DIRECTOR, FINANCE & RECORDS

TB:gc

Thad Brown, TAX COLLECTOR

# **PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, CATHERYN M. DALY, declare as follows:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the above-entitled action. I am employed at the City Attorney's Office of San Francisco, Fox Plaza Building, 1390 Market Street, Sixth Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

On June 8, 2018, I served the following document(s):

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO'S CONDITIONAL NON-OPPOSITION TO CSU TRUSTEES' MOTION REQUESTING JUDICIAL NOTICE; DECLARATION OF PETER J. KEITH

on the following persons at the locations specified:

California Court of Appeal 350 McAllister Street Division One San Francisco, CA 94102

Robert E. Asperger
Deputy Attorney General
Gonzalo C. Martinez
Deputy Solicitor General
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102
Email: Gonzalo.Martinez@doj.ca.gov
Email: bob.asperger@doj.ca.gov
Counsel for Respondent The Board of
Trustees of the California State University

Margaret L. Wu, Managing Counsel, Litigation
University of California
Office of the General Counsel
1111 Franklin St., 8th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel: (510) 987-9747
Fax: (510) 987-9757
Email: Margaret.Wu@ucop.edu
Counsel for Respondent Regents of the
University of California

Elise Traynum, General Counsel University of California Hasting College of the Law Office of the General Counsel 200 McAllister Street San Francisco, CA 94102-4978 Tel. (415) 565-4787 Email: traynume@uchastings.edu Counsel for Respondent Board of Directors of Hastings College of the Law

Benjamin P. Fay, Esq.
Gabriel McWhirter, Esq.
Jarvis Fay Doporto & Gibson, LLP
492 Ninth Street, Suite 310
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel. (510) 238-1400
Fax (510) 238-1404
Email: bfay@jarvisfay.com
Email: gmcwhirter@jarvisfay.com
Counsel for Respondent Board of
Directors of Hastings College of the Law

Bradley S. Phillips Benjamin J. Horwich Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP 560 Mission Street, 27th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105-2907 Tel. (415) 512-4000 Email: Ben.Horwich@mto.com Email: Brad.Phillips@mto.com

Co-Counsel for Respondent Regents of the University of California

Dila Mignouna
Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP
1155 F Street N.W., Seventh Floor
Washington, DC 20004-1357
Tel: (202) 220-1100
Email: Dahlia.Mignouna@mto.com
Co-Counsel for Respondent Regents of
the University of California

in the manner indicated below:

	BY UNITED STATES MAIL: Following ordinary business practices, I sealed true and correct copies of the above documents in addressed envelope(s) and placed them at my workplace for collection and mailing with the United States Postal Service. I am readily familiar with the practices of the San Francisco City Attorney's Office for collecting and processing mail. In the ordinary course of business, the sealed envelope(s) that I placed for collection would be deposited, postage prepaid, with the United States Postal Service that same day.
	BY PERSONAL SERVICE: I sealed true and correct copies of the above documents in addressed envelope(s) and caused such envelope(s) to be delivered by hand at the above locations by a professional messenger service. A declaration from the messenger who made the delivery is attached or will be filed separately with the court.
	<b>BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE:</b> Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept electronic service, I caused the documents to be served electronically through <b>TrueFiling</b> in portable document format ("PDF") Adobe Acrobat.
	BY FACSIMILE: Based on a written agreement of the parties to accept service by fax, I transmitted true and correct copies of the above document(s) via a facsimile machine at telephone number Fax #' to the persons and the fax numbers listed above. The fax transmission was reported as complete and without error. The transmission report was properly issued by the transmitting facsimile machine, and a copy of the transmission report is attached or will be filed separately with the court.
Califo	I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of rnia that the foregoing is true and correct.
	Executed June 8, 2018, at San Francisco, California.
	Catheryn M. Daly.